

"Another Play on Salem Witch Trials": Lion Feuchtwanger, Communists, and Nazis

Author(s): Waltraud Maierhofer

Source: *Comparative Drama*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (Fall 2009), pp. 355-378

Published by: [Comparative Drama](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23038097>

Accessed: 26-12-2015 09:11 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Comparative Drama is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Comparative Drama*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

“Another Play on Salem Witch Trials”: Lion Feuchtwanger, Communists, and Nazis

WALTRAUD MAIERHOFER

The Crucible (1953), by pre-eminent American playwright Arthur Miller (1915–2005), has become widely acknowledged as a timeless play about the hunt for “witches” and other supposed evildoers, and about mass hysteria. According to a popular introduction to this work, the inspiration for Arthur Miller’s play was *The Devil in Massachusetts* (1949), a historical study, albeit not without fictional elements, about the Salem witch trials by Marion Starkey.¹ It is a little-known fact that the German-Jewish émigré writer Lion Feuchtwanger (7 July 1884, Munich–21 December 1958, Los Angeles) published a play about the Salem trials before Arthur Miller did. It was published in German under the title *Wahn oder Der Teufel in Boston* (Mania or The Devil in Boston) in 1948 in Los Angeles.² A first sketch is dated 22 October 1945.³ Feuchtwanger began writing the play in the final months of 1946 and finished it in late 1947.

I. *The Devil in Boston*

The play premiered in Germany in March 1949, in the “Kleines Theater im Zoo” in Frankfurt am Main, directed by Fred Schroer. Feuchtwanger wrote a short statement about his play for the program, “Zu meinem Stück” (About My Play).⁴ The premiered version was slightly revised from the first American edition in German, and subsequent performances (Deutsches Theater Berlin, March 1949; Nürnberg, 1949) and book editions followed.⁵

Several stages of typescript translations in English are extant in the Feuchtwanger Archive at the University of Southern California, the first

dated August 1947. The titles vary slightly from *Delusion* to *Boston* to *Devil in Boston*, which appears to have met Feuchtwanger's final approval, and a corrected copy is marked "Copyright 1948").⁶ Feuchtwanger wanted to have the play performed in the United States in English, but was not immediately successful.⁷ The American-language premiere did not take place until February 1952 at the Circle Theatre in Hollywood (directed by Benjamin Zemach), where it remained in the repertoire for only half a year.⁸ Another staging, of a Yiddish translation by N[athaniel] Buchwald, took place the next year in New York by the Yiddish Theater Ensemble, in Barbiyon Plaza. Morris Carnovsky directed and performed in this production.⁹

Arthur Miller's *Crucible* (1953) premiered on Broadway on 22 January 1953 and was published that same year. Initially, it was not as sweepingly successful as it later became. Feuchtwanger's drama had its New York premiere in February 1953. The audience, including the critics, did not know of its earlier publication in German and its staging on the West Coast, leading one critic to label it as "Another Play On Salem Witches."¹⁰ Reviews of the New York performance immediately compared the two: Vernon Rice pointed out that Feuchtwanger's play had fewer dramatic high points, while his simpler plot and setting fared favorably with John Chapman. It is not important for the following argument whether the two writers knew about each other's plays and whether one might have influenced the other,¹¹ although it remains a valid question. Both draw attention to the mechanisms and dynamics of suspicion, denunciation, persecution, and extermination. Their approaches are very different in that Miller shows trial scenes onstage, while Feuchtwanger has them reported. Both fictionalize one of the "bewitched" girls and main plaintiffs, and incorporate love interests in her characterization, but these choices result in decisive plot differences. However, my goal is not to compare the two plays, but rather to examine the specific perspective of a stateless immigrant on this "American" topic, which the German-Jewish writer here applies to postwar, post-Nazi Germany.

Even Feuchtwanger scholarship tends to bypass this play. For example, a recent study on the reception of Feuchtwanger's works in Germany since 1945 only briefly touches on the play, stating as evident that it represented the author's reaction to the beginning of the McCarthy era and intended to draw parallels between persecutions of "witches" and leftists.¹² Only

one short comparison with Miller's *Crucible* has been undertaken, in which Robert F. Bell takes a stand against the widespread critical belief that both plays about the Salem witch hunts serve as allegoric treatments of the conduct of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Bell argues that Miller's central impulse was not a social phenomenon, but the interior psychological question of guilt in an adulterous relationship, which witch hysteria merely unleashed, whereas Feuchtwanger brought out the social dynamics of dogmatism, fanaticism, and paranoia.¹³ This article argues that *Devil in Boston* represents Feuchtwanger's return in spirit to Germany and a propitiating offer to his former persecutors, especially the next generation of Germans. Its favorable, but strangely low-key and short-lived, reception in both parts of postwar Germany, and the fact that the American staging hardly got off the ground and is now forgotten, support such a reading.

The composer Eric Zeisl (1905–59), a fellow émigré in Los Angeles from Austria, mentioned in an interview that he had seen *Devil in Boston* in Los Angeles and was eager to make it into an opera. He wished to turn Feuchtwanger's rather intimate play into a spectacle, though, complete with "mass scenes, scenes of judgment and executions and mystical, conjuring scenes."¹⁴ Gertrud Zeisl reported in an interview that Feuchtwanger was not willing to devote the necessary time to such a reworking, and therefore Eric Zeisl asked Victor Clement to do it, but the idea was not carried out. It is striking that a few years later, Miller's play on the Salem trials was adapted by a different composer, Robert Ward, into a Pulitzer Prize-winning and much-performed opera with plenty of such mass scenes. Ward's *The Crucible* premiered in 1961 at the New York City Opera, with a libretto by Bernard Stambler. Before these successes, Feuchtwanger had recognized the broad appeal of the Salem trials to the American theater audience.

II. An Author under Surveillance

Feuchtwanger wrote several successful historical novels, including his early *Jud Süß* (*Jew Süß*, 1925), on the eighteenth-century courtier-banker Joseph Süß Oppenheimer (adapted as a 1934 British film and a 1940 Nazi propaganda film by Veit Harlan), which was translated into over twenty

languages.¹⁵ It also became a bestseller in the English-speaking world (*The Jew Süß* in the British translation, *Power* in the American) and laid the foundation for Feuchtwanger's reputation as an author of serious, yet highly readable and entertaining, historical fiction. He subsequently wrote works on eminent figures of the Enlightenment (the Spanish painter Francisco Goya, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Benjamin Franklin) and from Jewish history (Raquel, the Jewess of Toledo, Jephtha and his daughter), his two main areas of interest besides Nazism and other contemporary issues. His most important work is the novel *Erfolg: Drei Jahre Geschichte einer Provinz* (*Success*, 1930), which portrayed and criticized the rise of fascism in Germany. In August 1933, Feuchtwanger's name was included in the first published list of "enemies of the German people"; his books were burned, he was stripped of his German nationality, and his doctoral degree (in German literature) and his house and property in Berlin were confiscated. Feuchtwanger decided not to return from a reading tour abroad and settled in southern France instead. He continued to criticize events and politics in Germany, for example, in the novel *Der falsche Nero* (*The False Nero*, aka *The Pretender*, 1936), in which he openly attacked Hitler's uprising.

When the Germans invaded France in 1940, Feuchtwanger was captured and imprisoned in an internment camp. In the following year, he managed to escape and to receive asylum in the United States. In 1941, he settled in Los Angeles in the German expatriate arts colony. He continued to write until his death in 1958—in German, like most of his fellow émigrés. He did well financially and acquired the Villa Aurora in Pacific Palisades.¹⁶ He befriended Bertolt Brecht and Heinrich and Thomas Mann. Brecht left the United States for the Sowjet zone of Berlin in 1947; Heinrich Mann planned to do so as well, but died in Santa Monica in 1950, while his brother Thomas, also increasingly disappointed by the post-1945 United States, managed to relocate to Switzerland in 1952. Feuchtwanger did not return to Europe after the war, but stayed in California—"des Klimas wegen" (because of the climate), as he used to say, ambivalently.¹⁷ He had several invitations to Germany, particularly from his writer friend Arnold Zweig, to visit East Berlin. In 1948 and again in 1957, he applied for American citizenship, but it was never granted. He did not travel abroad for fear of not being granted re-entry into the United

States. In an earlier book on his travels to the Soviet Union, *Moskau 1937* (*Moscow 1937*, 1937), he had naively praised life under Stalin. American authorities suspected that he maintained his communist/socialist views and kept him under surveillance.

Ian Wallace summarizes the posthumous reception of his works as dichotomized between international and German-language readers:

At his death he enjoyed an undisputed reputation in Eastern Europe and in the English-speaking world as one of Germany's most important writers. In stark contrast, his standing in divided Germany became one of contradictions.... [I]nfluential critics dismissed him as lightweight in aesthetic terms.¹⁸

According to his German publisher, there has been a strong recent resurgence of demand for Feuchtwanger's fiction, but scholarship about his works remains scarce. *The Devil in Boston*, one of twenty-nine plays, remains much less well known than his novels.

III. The Salem Witch Hunt and an Émigré's Perspective

The Salem witch trials are among the best-known and best-documented trials in the history of witchcraft persecution, and their historical background will be familiar to most readers. A short-lived but intense witch hunt in Salem Village, Massachusetts, resulted in twenty executions of innocent people between March and October of 1692, including Salem's former pastor George Burroughs. One of the persecuted, an old man, died of suffocation under the weight of heavy stones while being interrogated (correctly reported in Feuchtwanger's play, in act 2, scene 1), and all of the others were hanged. When the trials stopped, about fifty persons had bought their lives with confessions, about two hundred more had been accused of witchcraft, and about one hundred and fifty had already been imprisoned. The mania began with accusations by the daughter of the Salem Village pastor Samuel Parris (1653–1720) and led to a series of denunciations and trials, utter mistrust, fear, and barely hidden civil unrest. The hunt finally stopped (as portrayed in the play) quite suddenly when members of the elite were denounced. They demanded a new higher court, which quickly nullified further execution orders, revoked nearly all accusations, and set prisoners free. The last suspects were set free by the governor in April 1693. Cotton Mather (1663–1728) and his father

Increase Mather (1639–1723), who held the offices of First and Second Preacher in Boston, were prominently involved in the witch hunt.

Cotton Mather is a protagonist of Feuchtwanger's play, and his father is often mentioned. Feuchtwanger spells the Salem pastor Samuel Parris as "Parrish." His daughter, another important character, is named Hanna (historically, Elisabeth) and is sixteen years old in the play (instead of nine, as documented). The play stresses that the historical Cotton Mather was not only an important theologian, but, as such, a fervent believer in witchcraft. In act 1, scene 5, Mather and Colman discuss belief in witchcraft in principle and elaborate from their different viewpoints why the clergy needs belief in the devil and in witchcraft in order to stay in power. They mention several treatises written by the historical Mather (collected in *Memorable Providences: Relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions*, 1689), including his own case studies of witchcraft in the colonies. Among them was the "bewitched" girl Mercy Goodwin, whom Mather took into his house in 1688, and who is mentioned in the play (F 1948:17).¹⁹ Both Mathers justified the witch craze, contributed to it with their sermons and writings, and, in doing so, furthered the influence of their family. They both left written accounts of the 1692 witch trials.²⁰

The Mathers, a Protestant theocratic family, were highly influential in the English colony of Massachusetts and in its politics. They were also immediate descendants of its Puritan founding fathers. Both Increase and Cotton Mather were famous (both in the colony and in England) as eminent scholars and authors of a long list of scholarly titles (F 1948:130). Increase Mather served as president of Harvard University from 1685 to 1701. Contrary to popular belief today, Cotton Mather was not entirely opposed to scientific advancement: he greatly improved health care in the colony by advocating smallpox vaccinations.²¹

The play also draws on political issues in New England, such as tensions between the colonies' bourgeois upper class and its British governor, Sir Edmund Andros. In 1688, Increase Mather and other delegates traveled to London to get the colonies' rights and privileges renewed by King Charles II. In the following years, England became a constitutional monarchy, and Mather used the "Glorious Revolution" to negotiate a new bill of rights for the colonies with the new king, William III. Increase Mather returned to Boston in May 1692. At the same time, a new governor

and friend of the Mathers arrived, Sir William Phips, whose actions later proved decisive in ending the witch hunt.²² Feuchtwanger, in accordance with historical studies, identified as the crucial element for the dynamics of this particular witch hunt the unusual fact that in Salem, none of the accused who had denounced another person in order to save themselves were executed.

In an interview published before the play's opening in Los Angeles,²³ Feuchtwanger focused on the protagonist, the pastor Cotton Mather. The author said that he had wanted to find out how a scholar like Mather could continue to believe in witches in an age when science around him was making rapid progress: "His argument was simply this: If the Devil did not exist, then neither did God exist. And this heresy Mather was not prepared to tolerate."²⁴ Feuchtwanger thoroughly researched each and every one of his historical subjects. In this case he had read not only historical studies, but works by Mather himself.²⁵ Before writing the play, he also studied the biography of Franklin, who embodied, for him as for many Americans, enlightenment, rationality, and progress. In this interview (which also stated that the author was busy with his next novel and did not attend rehearsals), Feuchtwanger did not mention parallels of the Salem persecutions with the hunt for communist "witches" in the postwar United States. As he pointed out about his works of historical fiction in general, "I am not concerned with writing history.... [They] are contemporary because the evolutionary factors I show in operation are equally valid in all ages. The historical process is both random and direct. Like Nature ..." ²⁶

Feuchtwanger changed a few facts from the historical accounts in addition to the girl accuser's age mentioned above. He made Cotton Mather older, 45 rather than 29, and gave him a seventeen-year-old son, while the historical character had only been married for six years. Increase Mather is mentioned, but does not appear onstage. Cotton Mather represents the work and beliefs of both. Most importantly, Feuchtwanger adds another main male character, Mather's brother-in-law, the physician Dr. Thomas Colman, who serves as an enlightened contrast to Mather's conservative religious beliefs. Mather is shown and discussed as a theological writer, with two of his works mentioned in the play, namely, an account of the Christian Church in New England, *Magnalia Christi Americana* (F 1948:4), and a translation of the psalms, *Psalterium Americanum* (F 1948:89),

although historically, they were published a few years after the trials, in 1702 and 1718, respectively. Also, he was not elected into London's Royal Academy of Sciences (mentioned in act 2, scene 14) until 1714.²⁷

The circumstances under which Feuchtwanger wrote the play also have to be considered, just as with Miller's *The Crucible*. In dramatizing historical witch hunts, both could refer to contemporary "witch hunts" and the dark, irrational, and reactionary forces in America which, after the end of World War II, helped precipitate the Cold War. While the 1950s became especially known for anticommunism and were coined "the McCarthy Era" after the fiercely anticommunist senator Joseph McCarthy, a writer like Feuchtwanger, a Jewish exile from Nazi Germany, but in the United States suspected as a leftist, was susceptible to such accusations earlier, even in the second half of the 1940s. During 1950s McCarthyism, when congressional investigations of suspected communists were spreading to many intellectuals, Miller found a wider audience for this topic with *The Crucible*, with its gripping adultery plot and themes of guilt and plagued conscience. The term "Red witch hunting," not invented during the McCarthy era, was used as early as the 1930s for the persecution of leftists and communists by the congressional Committee for the Examination of Un-American Acts. Around 1940, the Texas senator Martin Dies was already known as "the witch-hunter of Texas." In 1946, the House Un-American Activities Committee was confirmed. Feuchtwanger presented at the International Writers Conference in Los Angeles in 1943, which was scrutinized as being possibly communist-led.²⁸ In 1941, the FBI pressed for his deportation, but there was not enough evidence to violate US statutes. Between July 1941 and January 1959, Feuchtwanger was the subject of routine surveillance of his contacts and activities, resulting in a voluminous FBI file.²⁹ After he petitioned for naturalization with the INS, the interrogations in 1957–58 about his stance toward Communism were "very strenuous," as his wife, Marta Feuchtwanger, wrote in her memoirs, to say the least.³⁰ Lion Feuchtwanger was denied American citizenship, because, according to the INS examiner's report of December 1957, he failed to establish "that he has been attached to the principles of the Constitution and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States."³¹ He died a few months after this report, still stateless.

IV. Bewitched: “A Welcome Distraction”

In his 1945 outline of the play, Feuchtwanger wrote:

Die Kolonie Massachusetts, die von einem brutalen Gouverneur autoritär verwaltet wurde, erhofft sich unter dem neuen König die Herstellung der alten Privilegien und hat zu diesem Behuf einen Agenten nach London gesandt. Dieser Agent beginnt aber bald mit Männern der Ordnung in London zu zetteln, die es bedenklich finden, wenn man dem Volk zu viel Freiheit gibt. Während so der Kampf um die Privilegien der Kolonien zum Teil offen, aber zum größten Teil unterirdisch geführt wird, glauben in dem Orte Salem in Massachusetts einige halbwüchsige Mädchen ... sie seien behext.... Die Leute, welche nach den Aussagen der Mädchen sie behext haben, werden prozessiert, das ganze Land horcht auf, und es scheint gewissen Politikern diese Sensation eine willkommene Ablenkung des Volkes von dem Kampf um die Privilegien.... Vergeblich versuchen fortschrittlichere Leute, dem Unwesen Einhalt zu tun.³²

(The colony of Massachusetts, which was administered by a brutal governor, hopes for the restitution of the old privileges under the new king and has sent an agent to London in this matter. This agent, however, begins to argue with men representing the old order in London, who find it questionable when the people are given too much freedom. Thus the fight for the privileges of the colonies is conducted partially openly, but mostly under the surface. Meanwhile a few adolescent girls in Salem Village in Massachusetts believe ... that they are bewitched. The persons who, according to the girls' statements, have bewitched them are put to trial; the whole country listens up, and it appears that this scorcher is for certain politicians a welcome distraction for the people from the quarrel over the privileges.... More progressive persons try in vain to halt the wretchedness.)

In the play, Feuchtwanger carried out this original plan, with the first part of the outline only narrated and discussed after the fact. The play takes place in Mather's study in Boston in 1692. The outside events (which include the trials with their interrogations and the executions) are reported and discussed in a traditional way by the persons invited into the preacher's private place of scholarship. Feuchtwanger did not experiment with forms of “epic theater,” with which he was very familiar through his friendship and collaboration with Brecht.³³ Clearly, the play examines Mather and his study of witchcraft, not the showier public persecution.

A short summary will suffice here, although it does not do justice to the dialogue, which is full of interesting detail. The opening scene presents Mather translating a passage about the pastor as shepherd, which

characterizes him effectively. His cool welcome of his brother-in-law shows strict self-discipline, but also pride. He feels chosen for his work in the name of God's grace. Colman has just returned from the journey with Mather's father to London. He disapproves of the new charter and is in favor of rebellion, while Mather supports the charter. Parrish brings his daughter, Hanna, who suffers from paroxysms. Mather is eager to study and cure the "bewitched" girl (behex; F 1948:17), while the physician sees only a pretty adolescent girl craving attention and retelling things she heard elsewhere. Hanna tries to make the somewhat clumsy and shy Richard, Mather's son, become infatuated with her. When questioned, she accuses the servant Tituba of witchcraft. Colman accuses Mather of welcoming the fight against witches and the devil at the exact time that the colony is upset with the new charter. He implies that Mather aims to distract them (F 1948:26).

At the beginning of act 2, fourteen persons have already been executed for witchcraft. Hanna insists that she is not responsible for the consequences of her words, as the decisions are made by wise men and people believe what they want to believe. Again, it is Colman who addresses the reasons why innocent people are being persecuted; for him, it is clear that the fault lies in the method of the trials, which leads to the hanging of those who insist on being innocent, but pardons those who confess and denounce others. As Colman points out, the accused are mostly old, delusional women who say all sorts of things and names when promised to be set free after doing so (F 1948:65). Several girls are now "bewitched." Hanna accuses George Burroughs, a former pastor in Salem Village, of having led a "witches' sabbath." Her interrogation by Mather is a splendid case of manipulation by a girl who knows her audience—and a man who uses her for his purposes, because she sees what Mather wants to believe, as again pointed out by Colman: "Durch deine unsinnige Schreiberei hast du die Hirne und die Herzen verdunkelt. Diese Hanna Parrish sieht nur, was du willst, dass sie sehe" (You have darkened men's minds and hearts with your senseless scribbling. This Hannah Parrish sees only what you wish her to see; act 2, scene 2, F 1948:74).

After Burroughs has been executed (before act 3, scene 1), all the while insisting on his innocence, more and more people have doubts about the trials, including the New York clergy and even London officials, who

want to abolish the special court. Only Abigail Mather believes strongly in her husband. Parrish reports that the wife of the richest man in Salem was arrested for witchcraft, but her influential husband accused the denouncer's father of defamation and had *him* arrested also. Thus, the denunciations and the trials come to an end. This is shown when Judge Sewall (after his wife has been denounced) addresses the people from the study's window and tells them that the devil has confused the leaders of the country, not the executed ones who were innocent. He confesses his guilt, accepts the blame, and breaks down. Now, for the first time, the public no longer listens to Mather's vehement speeches against the devil. Mather is still convinced that he is right, but the people reject him and his leadership. Parrish has decided to leave the colony, where he would have been ridiculed. Colman wants to go to England and work toward a better constitution, while the people forget the trials. Hanna, who had earlier urged Richard to flee with her, hangs herself. This moves Richard to join Colman and leave his father, who still strongly believes in witchcraft and his own special status as chosen by God.

V. Fanaticism, Opposition, and Survival

Throughout the play, Cotton Mather is presented as a scholar, member of the clergy, community leader, and authoritarian father and husband. He is convinced that he knows the ways and the will of God, which makes him a tool of God and a strong leader. His conversations with the fictional character Colman, who is a physician, scientist, treasurer of the colony, and humanitarian, emphasize the opposing tendencies of this period. This opposition is between strict belief in God and the Bible and authority as a form of leadership, on the one hand, and free-spiritedness and the quest for scientific knowledge and democratic rights, on the other. The fictional brother-in-law allows these themes to be addressed in the intimacy of the house, over which Mather otherwise has strict control, as shown in the scenes with his subservient and admiring wife and son. Mather uses science (for example, vaccinations) and independent thinking (in an earlier fight against the governor) when it is to the advantage of his family and its leadership role, while on other occasions he acts convinced he is a chosen one and privileged to interpret God's word and

put it into action. Colman diagnoses as much in the very first scene, where the two are introduced arguing about science and belief, and in return is rebuked for rebelling “gegen die gottgewollte Ordnung” (against this God-given order; F 1948:6). Mather proclaims to his opponent: “du bist der gleiche geblieben. Thomas Colman, widerspenstig, ungläubig vor der Autorität, unzufrieden” (you’re the same obdurate malcontent and disbeliever in authority; F 1948:2–3). The son has more and more doubts, as the two opponents try to keep him loyal or win him over, and, in the end, he gets to choose which side to be on. Mather is as strong-willed and “unrelenting” (unerbittlich; F 1948:47) toward others as he is toward himself, observes Colman. In this scene, Colman diagnoses Mather’s overzealousness and self-righteousness as the core issue, which will later lead to and become apparent in the witch hunt: “Schon auf der Schule habe ich dich darauf aufmerksam gemacht: es steht nicht allein bei den Mathers, zu entscheiden, in wessen Brust Gott wohnt und in wessen der Teufel” (Even in school I was already telling you that it does not rest with the Mathers alone to decide whether a man’s breast harbors God—or the Devil; F 1948:5). Mather, however, insists that the Mathers are chosen by God to lead a Bible-based state and to interpret and execute God’s will; furthermore, he pursues “free spirits” (Freigeister; F 1948:6) for their own good and persecutes independent thinking.³⁴

As he speaks for reason and enlightenment, Colman argues with Mather and tries to win him over to his side, but eventually acquiesces to his order to leave. He does not fight more aggressively and try to bring more people to the side of reason.³⁵ One particular statement by Colman is telling. It is remarkable that Feuchtwanger cut this explicit statement from the revised German version, which formed the basis for the English translation. Here Colman justifies his behavior before Mather’s son, who asks him why he does not tell everyone his rational view. Colman explains that this is a question that many men of science have had to face during the last two hundred years, and goes on:

Vielleicht macht Wissen feige. So viel steht fest: manches Mal haben sich gerade die kühnsten Denker vor der Dummheit ihrer Umwelt gebeugt.... Es ist nicht angenehm, seine Zunge zu verschlucken, aber zuweilen ist es das einzige Mittel, böse Zeiten zu überleben. Und ein toter Held ist den Menschen weniger nützlich als ein lebendiger Wissenschaftler. (act 3, scene 1, F 1948:86)

(Maybe, knowledge makes one a coward. That much is certain: often times, especially the most bold thinkers bowed before the stupidity of their surroundings.... It is not pleasant, to bite one's tongue, but occasionally it is the only means to survive bad times. And a dead hero is less useful to the people than a living scientist.)

In 1948, this could be read as a defense of those artists and scientists who “bowed” and “bit their tongues,” who were uncritical or did not dare to voice their criticism of the Nazi regime because they wanted to stay in Germany. This stance enables communication between exiled intellectuals like Feuchtwanger and “inner emigrants.” It grants both groups a new beginning, whereas, as Frank Stern has pointed out, “the hidden voices of the Germanic inner emigration that came proudly forward now” looked “disdainfully down on writers” who had chosen exile.³⁶

Earlier, Colman calls for empathy toward good-willed people who are unable to think independently under any intimidating authoritarian system when he says, “Selbständig zu urteilen ist furchtbar schwer, wenn ringsum alle unfrei denken” (It is very hard to retain independent judgment when all those around are thinking along prescribed lines; act 2, scene 1, F 1948:43). This would apply to the “ordinary Germans” who had supported Nazism. It is interesting to note that a Swiss review of a 1949 production by the Russian State Theater in East Berlin did not pick up on these aspects at all, but instead speculated that the play was chosen for ideological reasons and produced in order to draw attention to the fact that—according to the communist press—in America “anständige Kommunisten” (decent communists) were being “als Hexen verbrannt” (burned as witches).³⁷ In the 1960s, when the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials heightened awareness of Nazism’s atrocities, West German television produced a feature film adaptation of *Devil in Boston*.³⁸ Hailed as a “TV-Überraschung” (TV surprise),³⁹ it was seen by 39 percent of West Germans watching television that evening, and it fared extremely favorably with the audience.⁴⁰ Did it do so because of its conciliatory attitude toward the past or because it was to be understood as “Protest gegen Kommunistenverhetzung” (protest against sedition of communists), as one critic wrote, and was a text that was “geheimnislos,” that held no secrets?⁴¹

Let’s return to the main characters. Hanna appears childlike, trusting, and well-behaved; she is curious, just like any sixteen-year-old would be.

She likes riding horses and hears that is not appropriate for a girl. She is very skilled in making remedies with herbs, is eager to learn new skills and acquire knowledge, and bemoans her boring life and the things girls are taught. She very much enjoyed the one short trip she took with her father awhile back. She likes to be listened to and has a lot of imagination, which both Colman and Richard acknowledge. "Sie sind eine Dichterin," says Richard (You are a poet; act 3, scene 5, F 1948:91). However, she is not just a victim of boredom. She betrays dependent persons and former friends, and the washerwoman calls her a "Lausebalg" (which Mussey translates as "brat" but, more literally, means "parasitic little twit") and "Verleumderin," or denouncer (act 1, scene 9, F 1948:34).⁴² When performing her afflictions—and they are clearly performances, which she controls at will—she is quite theatrical and convincing. She pretends to fast but does not, and only Colman and, later, Mather's wife see through her pretenses. When alone with Richard, she is not as modest and shy as one might expect; in fact, she is quite direct, even aggressive, in testing his chivalrousness and in her demands for his affection. At one point, she burns pages from Mather's report, where he had written unflatteringly about her, and clearly expects Richard to cover for her, which he does. When she implies that Richard should leave with her (her idea!), the stage directions emphasize that she kisses him wildly (104). Like any adolescent, she wants to be unique and important. This may cause her to buy into Mather's line of argument about witchcraft.

She is neither naive nor stupid: she knows her role in the executions but evades responsibility by arguing that she is a necessary tool: "Manche Leute sagen, ich bin schuld, dass die Hexen an die Galgeneiche gehängt worden sind. Vielleicht bin ich schuld. Denn ich bin das Werkzeug" (Some people say it is my fault that the witches were hanged on the locust tree. Perhaps it is. For I am the instrument"; act 3, scene 5, F 1948:92). When this role ends, she is desperate—not about her guilt, but rather, about her loss of face and importance and her return to a boring life.

The men don't believe that Hanna can simply perform afflictions and have imaginary encounters with the devil; instead, someone else has to cause her pain and fear. This is obvious when Parrish asks Burroughs, "Wer quält sie, wenn nicht Sie?" (Who torments her if not you? act 2, scene 10, F 1948:71). When she is not performing, she again acts and is

treated as a child who is innocent but also lacks her own will and agency. Really, her “normal” behavior and treatment are not very different from those of Mather’s wife, Abigail. As the stage directions instruct, Abigail is to be “*blass von Aussehen und von Wesen*” (rather pallid of appearance and personality; act 1, scene 2, F 1948:12). She defends and supports her husband to the end without receiving much in return. In the end, Hanna prefers suicide to facing accusations and the consequences of her actions, but it is also an act of her own will. She dies by hanging, the same way those accused by her of witchcraft died.

Already at the beginning of the play, Mather’s fictional(ized) seventeen-year-old son, Richard, is shown as torn between his father’s order to become a clergyman and take on the family tradition and (following Colman) his own interests in botany. Richard wants to be loyal to his father but is heavily moved by the play’s events and in the end chooses, in a deliberate act of free will, to join the side of reason, science, and democracy over belief, religion, and oligarchy. The emphasis on this character points to the fact that psychological and sociopsychological conflicts—albeit in simplified and easily comprehensible representations—were more significant for Feuchtwanger than socioeconomic thought.⁴³ Also, Judge Sewall’s personal conflict is emphasized more than his role as a representative of the upper class and its economic force. The play’s characters act and react like twentieth-century individuals, not in the way that the Salem documents indicate.⁴⁴

VI. Salem Witch Hunts and the Holocaust: The Distant and the Not-So-Distant Past

Critics occasionally accuse Feuchtwanger of being too obvious with his messages, too direct about the parallels he was drawing with the present when he took up historical topics.⁴⁵ In addition, he often published statements about his works explaining motives and intentions. His short text written for the program of the German premiere of *Devil in Boston* is unusually brief and vague. Therefore, it is included in full here:

Mehrmals in meinem wechsellvollen Leben hatte ich Gelegenheit zu beobachten, wie verständige, scharfsichtige, ja bedeutende Männer sich nicht frei machen konnten von Wahnvorstellungen, die ihrer Umgebung

geläufig waren. Oftmals auch nützen solche Männer ihre Vorurteile für politische, soziale, ökonomische Zwecke und richten so ungeheures Unheil an.

Die üble Renaissance des Fanatismus und des Vorurteils, welche der Krieg in vielen Ländern bewirkt hat, ließen mich einen alten Plan aufgreifen: darzustellen nämlich, wie ein großer Mann sich aus Politik und Überzeugung immer tiefer in Netze des Wahns verstrickt und eine wüste Welle der Verfolgung über sein Land hereinbrechen läßt.

Der Prediger und Historiker Cotton Mather, der seinen Zeitgenossen nicht zu Unrecht als der bedeutendste Repräsentant Amerikas galt, dieser Schriftsteller, so seltsam gemischt aus Pedanterie, echter und falscher Gelehrsamkeit, Fanatismus, Schauspielerei und wahrer Größe, schien mir für meinen Zweck der rechte Mann und die Hexenjagd, die er veranstaltete, der rechte Gegenstand. Was mich aber an seiner Geschichte am meisten anzog, war ihr Ausgang. Der Zusammenbruch der Hexenjagd Cotton Mathers ist, scheint mir, voll Lehre und Hoffnung auch für uns. Die Massen lassen sich täuschen, doch nicht für lange; so schnell sie sich berauschen, werden sie nüchtern.

Zudem fand ich in dem Sprecher der Massen, in dem Richter Sewall, der schlicht und großartig seinen Irrtum bekennt, einen starken Vertreter alles dessen, was uns am amerikanischen Volke gut und vertrauenserweckend erscheint. Und der Sieg des Verstandes über den Wahn, dieser Sieg, der das Drama der amerikanischen Hexenjagd beschließt, gab mir willkommene Gelegenheit, darzustellen meinen eigenen tiefen Glauben an Fortschritt und Vernunft.⁴⁶

(Several times in my eventful life I have had the opportunity to observe how judicious, keen-sighted, even important men were unable to free themselves from delusions that were common in their surroundings. Often such men even utilize their prejudices for political, social, and economic ends and thus cause tremendous disaster.

An evil renaissance of fanaticism and prejudice, which has resulted in war in many countries, has caused me to return to an old plan of mine: that is, to depict how a great man, because of politics and conviction, ensnares himself deeper and deeper in nets of delusion and causes a vast wave of persecution to befall his country.

The preacher and historian Cotton Mather, whom his contemporaries rightfully regarded as the most significant representative of America—this writer, a strange mix of pedantry, right and wrong erudition, fanaticism, play acting, and true greatness—appeared to be the right man for my goal and the witch hunt that he set in motion, the right object. However, the element in his story that attracted me most was its ending. It seems to me that the breakdown of Cotton Mather's witch hunt is full of lessons and hope, even for us. The masses let themselves be deceived, but not for long; just as fast as they get high, they become sober.

In addition, I found in the speaker for the masses, Judge Sewall, who in a simple and grand manner confesses his error, a strong representative of everything that appears to us as good and inspiring confidence in the American people. Victory of reason over mania concludes the drama of the American witch hunt, and this victory provided a welcome opportunity for me to depict my own deep belief in progress and reason.)

Feuchtwanger portrayed the Salem persecutions as a regression into irrationality. His view of history as a battle of reason and progress against irrationality is evident in this play. Colman, as the representative of reason, explains the witch hunt as an intentional distraction of the people from more concrete political issues by Mather. Mather wants to keep political power in New England and in his family. The historical topic serves as a warning against repetitions of such fanatic hunts, be they aimed against “bewitched” individuals (in Salem), against Jews and other minorities (as in Hitler’s Germany), or against communist and other “anti-American” activities (as in late-1940s and 1950s America). The play also shows the resurgence of superstition and mass mania as short-lived and being overcome by reason. This optimistic aspect was particularly important for the play’s subsequent performances and publication in post-fascist Germany, which silently welcomed its concluding optimistic message about forgetting and a new beginning.⁴⁷ Richard, who has been torn between obedience to his father and his own inclination toward thinking for himself and rationality, symbolizes the young generation almost too openly. When on 31 March 1948 the United States officially ended (as a byproduct of the Cold War) denazification in the American sector of Germany, many trials were concluded without a verdict and many former Nazis went unpunished.⁴⁸

Feuchtwanger portrays Mather as truly believing in witchcraft. Because of his authority and standing, he not only contributes to a mass mania, but his religious fanaticism is the major cause.⁴⁹ He is convinced he is acting in the name of God, a form of hubris he is unable to question. As early as 1930, in his novel *Success*, Feuchtwanger sought, as did other German writers in exile, to examine the fascination with fascism for a great number of educated people and the willingness, even mania, of ordinary Germans to accept and enforce irrational and barbarian dogmas, an issue that has been addressed by many recent historical studies. Mather can be read as an early attempt to portray and come to terms with individual and collective mania.⁵⁰ The play addresses how

people—“die dumme, leichtgläubige Menge” (the stupid, credulous mob; act 3, scene 2, F 1948:87)—are easily influenced but return to reason in the end. Especially the postwar German audience must have welcomed this message. What makes it quite astounding is the fact that it came from an exiled German-Jewish writer after the Holocaust. In several scenes, Mather is shown as a splendid orator who manipulates and belittles the masses with his rhetorical skills and fervor. The revised German version cut some of the historical information on Salem and made the play even more obviously a parable of fascist Germany. It was received as such, and critics applauded it as an important work of new German democratic and socialist literature.⁵¹

Since the 1960s, German writers have found many ways to come to terms with the past and directly address fascism and the Holocaust. *Devil in Boston* is an overlooked but important historical document for German-Jewish writing after 1945. Feuchtwanger may have been looking for topics that an American audience could easily relate to and embrace, and he may have been provoked by his surveillance as an alleged enemy of liberal capitalism in postwar America, but this play shows that, apart from the language, he ended up writing more about the German past and present than about Salem.

A New Historicist perspective illuminates the appeal of Feuchtwanger's play to contemporary readers, beyond its being a historical document. It emphasizes the act of denunciation, the power of the word and of the authority it lends, as well as fictional elements in memory and the writing of history. “Neunzehn Menschen sind umgebracht worden, weil Sie— (*Er sucht nach dem Wort.*) erzählt haben,” says Richard (Nineteen men and women have died because you ... told tales; act 3, scene 10, F 1948: 104). Storytelling leads to executions, but also to fame as a historian, depending on circumstances and social standing. The first and last scene show Mather in his study, writing historiographical accounts. Even during the trials, Mather strives to write what he considers a reliable report, but his own convictions and expectations heavily manipulate his account of the trials and their outcomes. The historiographer is not objective, but heavily biased. History is written by those in power. The closing monologue is from Mather, who, even after he has been proven wrong, prays to God to help him continue the fight against the devil and to report the events

in writing. This ending may question Feuchtwanger's own sources. It also affirms the fictionality of his play: it takes scenes and dialogues not directly from historical accounts, but as they could have happened.

Likewise, effective opposition to mania is not simply a matter of insight and rationality, but of power and authority in addition to the word. Only an influential, powerful man can stop the hunts and turn things around. Colman can be read as a defense and apology for Feuchtwanger's own past as a writer fighting fascism from a safe distance, even if the author emphasized historical interests and made no reference to the present and his own experiences in the interview mentioned above and in the program notes.

The timing of the 1949 performance in Germany shortly after the completion of the play is not to be underestimated. As Frank Stern reminds us, "With the new literary public sphere, the *cordon sanitaire* of German memory, as Primo Levi termed it years later, remained a delicate dividing line, a cultural twilight zone where it could be understood that not too many Jewish authors should be printed."⁵² The key to Feuchtwanger's reacceptance into postwar German literature with this play was that it was not openly about Nazi Germany, but about the history of one of the Allied forces. "Writing is surely a form of return," wrote Hannah Arendt in 1946, when she declined an invitation to publish in a German journal. "We can return only if we are welcome as Jews," she added.⁵³ With his play, Feuchtwanger did not insist on being recognized as Jewish, but rather as a German-speaking writer with expertise in American history and common themes in Western history.⁵⁴ At the time of the premiere, "Germany" still consisted of Allied-occupied zones with a military government, and all printed materials and radio and television broadcasts were subject to censorship and licensing.⁵⁵ *Devil in Boston* clearly fulfilled the Allied postwar "cultural vision of a reborn democratic and humanist Germany that would forever erase militarism, chauvinism, racism, and anti-Semitism."⁵⁶ On the other hand, the Salem trials, which offered life in exchange for denunciations, serve as a convincing representation of the ambiguous power of authority, a broader and timeless moral issue.

Lion Feuchtwanger was one of the most important German-Jewish intellectuals who, very soon after 1945, wrote about Germany again and cooperated with publishers and theaters to have their pre-1933 works

redistributed. His unjustly forgotten play *Mania or The Devil in Boston* is very close to the historical facts of the Salem witch trials. Like Miller's *The Crucible*, with its depiction of the mechanism of denunciation, *Mania* alludes to anti-communist surveillance in the United States. In addition, Feuchtwanger "translated" an American historical event from the perspective of a formerly persecuted writer into a subtle play about new beginnings after total surrender and the end of Nazi-mania. This play's views on political mania and fanatic persecution avoid confrontation and are surprisingly placatory.

University of Iowa

NOTES

A German Exile Studies Research Grant supported my consultation of materials in the Feuchtwanger Memorial Library at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles. A fellowship by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation assisted the completion of further research for this article.

¹ M. N. Jimerson, *Understanding "The Crucible"* (San Diego: Lucent, 2003), 34. See Marion Lena Starkey, *The Devil in Massachusetts: A Modern Inquiry into the Salem Witch Trials* (New York: Knopf, 1950).

² Lion Feuchtwanger, *Wahn oder Der Teufel in Boston: Ein Stück in drei Akten* (Los Angeles: Pazifische, 1948); all quotations from this edition are henceforth cited in the text as F 1948.

³ Lion Feuchtwanger, outline of *Der Teufel in Boston*, typescript, Feuchtwanger Archive, in the Feuchtwanger Memorial Library, University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Also mentioned by Hans Dahlke in Lion Feuchtwanger, *Dramen*, ed. Hans Dahlke, 2 vols. (Berlin: Aufbau, 1984), 2:782.

⁴ Lion Feuchtwanger, "Zu meinem Stück 'Wahn oder Der Teufel in Boston,'" in Feuchtwanger, *Dramen*, 2: 574–75.

⁵ Cf. Lion Feuchtwanger, *Wahn in Boston* (Berlin: Aufbau-Bühnenvertrieb, 1949); and Lion Feuchtwanger, *Wahn oder Der Teufel in Boston*, in *Dramen*, 2 vols., ed. Hans Dahlke (Berlin: Aufbau, 1984), 2:491–573. Quotations from the latter edition are hereafter cited in the text as F 1984.

⁶ Along with two manuscript versions, there exist numerous copies of two typescripts, one a translation by Renata Lenart, the other by J. Barrows Mussey, in D 43 of the Feuchtwanger Archive; see the online inventory <<http://www.usc.edu/archives/arc/findingaids/feuchtwanger/inventory.html>>. I have proposed publication of the final version by Barrows Mussey, with extensive notes, to an appropriate series of literature in translation.

⁷ The folder with American newspaper reviews in the Feuchtwanger Archive (ibid., sig. E8a) contains only reviews of this original performance, as well as the Yiddish one in New York in the following year, 1953. An internet search for *Devil in Boston* resulted in only one document, namely on a performance in Romania at the State Theatre Constanta, directed by Ion Maximilian <<http://www.teatrul-odeon.ro/eng/oameni/actori/neculce.htm>>, accessed 10 March 2006. Feuchtwanger's oeuvre was widely acknowledged in the Eastern-bloc countries.

⁸ Miller, who lived in New York, may or may not have been aware of the play's production at the Circle Theatre. Also in 1952, Miller visited the Salem Historical Society's "Witch Museum" to do research for *The Crucible*.

⁹ This information derives from the following reviews: John Chapman, "Devil in Boston: New York Drama to Be Done in Yiddish Laxs [Links] First Witch Hunt to Minister," *Boston Post*, 31 Jan. 1953 (clipping in Feuchtwanger Archive, E8a); John Chapman, "Yiddish Group in New Drama of Witch Trials," *New York Daily News*, 22 Feb. 1953 (ibid.); Vernon Rice, "Another Play On Salem Witches," *New York Post*, 18 Feb. 1953 (ibid.).

¹⁰ Rice.

¹¹ According to Chapman, Miller supposedly wrote his first draft while a student at the University of Michigan (1932–38). For a recent French study that assumes that Miller was inspired by Feuchtwanger's play, see Claudie Villard, *L'œuvre dramatique de Lion Feuchtwanger (1905–1948) et sa réception à la scène* (Berne: Peter Lang, 1994).

¹² Angela Vaupel, *Zur Rezeption von Exilliteratur und Lion Feuchtwangers Werk in Deutschland: 1945 bis heute* (Berne: Peter Lang, 2007), 23, 175. She does not substantiate her observation. The author of the new biography of Marta Feuchtwanger also mentions the play only in connection with surveillance of Lion Feuchtwanger. He states that its "message" was well understood by its audience, which included such famous names as Thomas Mann, Aldous Huxley, and Christopher Isherwood; see Manfred Flüge, *Die vier Leben der Marta Feuchtwanger* (Berlin: Aufbau, 2008), 343.

¹³ Robert F. Bell, "Perspectives on Witch Hunts: Lion Feuchtwanger and Arthur Miller," in *Deutsches Exildrama und Exiltheater: Akten des Exilliteratur-Symposiums der University of South Carolina 1976*, ed. Wolfgang Elfe, James Hardin, and Günther Holst, *Jahrbuch für Internationale Germanistik A3* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1977), 113–18.

¹⁴ [Gertrud Zeisl], "Oral history," Interview [Cole] with Gertrud Zeisl, 26 August 1975, *Eric Zeisl Oral History Transcript His Life and Music* (online), <http://www.archive.org/stream/ericzeisl/oralhis00zeisl/oralhis00zeisl_djvu.txt>.

¹⁵ Ian Wallace, "Lion Feuchtwanger," in *The Literary Encyclopedia*, 2004 (online), <<http://www.litencyc.com/php/speople.php?rec=true&UID=1514>>.

¹⁶ In his FBI file, a "confidential informant," possibly an envious fellow writer and émigré, described Feuchtwanger in a 1947 report as "a clever writer whose success has been prodigious." Quoted in Alexander Stephan, "Lion Feuchtwanger: Die FBI-Akte," in *Die Resonanz des Exils: Gelungene und mißlungene Rezeption deutschsprachiger Exilautoren*, ed. Dieter Sevin (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1992), 66–79 (69).

¹⁷ Klaus Modick, "Zum 100. Geburtstag Lion Feuchtwangers," *Neue Deutsche Hefte* 184 (1984): 876–81, (880). By examining the correspondence of Feuchtwanger, Arnold Zweig, and his secretary Lola Humm-Sernau, Karl Kröhnke has argued that Feuchtwanger had a perfectly organized and efficient "literary workshop." Being independent in what and how he wanted to write was most important to him. He detested the kind of censorship and political committee work that Zweig experienced in East Berlin; see Karl Kröhnke, "Der Weltbürger als Staatenloser: Über die Aporien des späten Feuchtwanger," *Neophilologus* 78 (1994): 289–300, (290–91). Most of his late works are historical fiction with international topics (they include biblical themes, the Spanish Inquisition, the American War of Independence, and the French Revolution). He found favor with an international audience and the mass market and restrained himself from addressing hot political issues. Marcel Reich-Ranicki criticized all these aspects of his work in "Lion Feuchtwanger oder Der Weltruhm des Emigranten," in *Die deutsche Exilliteratur 1933–1945*, ed. Manfred Durzak (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1973), 443–56.

¹⁸ Wallace.

¹⁹ Unless otherwise noted, translations (referenced by act and scene number) are from the unpublished translation Lion Feuchtwanger, *Devil in Boston*, trans. J. Barrows Mussey, final version, typescript, Feuchtwanger Archive, sig. E8a D 42.

²⁰ Hans Dahlke, "Nachbemerkung," in Feuchtwanger, *Dramen*, 2: 782–97, (785–86). Father and son wrote about the trials in Increase Mather, *Cases of Conscience: Concerning Evil Spirits* (London, 1693); and Cotton Mather, *The Wonders of the Invisible World* (London, 1693).

²¹ This paragraph derives from Dahlke, 783–84.

²² *Ibid.*, 784–85.

²³ Mildred Norton, "Broomsticks Flew over Old Boston. Circle Play Relates 17th Century Reign of Terror [interview with Lion Feuchtwanger]," *Daily News* (Los Angeles), 19 Feb. 1952 (clipping in Feuchtwanger Archive, E8a).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ The Feuchtwanger Archive possesses a typed list of sources ("Literatur zu den Studien für Lion Feuchtwangers Theaterstück *Wahn oder Der Teufel in Boston*") containing nineteen titles from 1702 (Mather) to 1950 (Starkey, see n. 1). The latter title may be evidence that Feuchtwanger kept up with new publications leading up to the American performance of his play.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Dahlke, 787.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 789–90.

²⁹ Stephan, 70, 67.

³⁰ Marta Feuchtwanger, unpublished typescript memoirs, *An Émigré Life*, as quoted in *ibid.*, 72.

³¹ As quoted in *ibid.*, 75.

³² Feuchtwanger, outline of *Der Teufel in Boston*. My translation.

³³ Brecht and Feuchtwanger cooperated on the play *Die Gesichte der Simone Machard* (*The Visions of Simone Machard*, 1940), which invoked the Joan of Arc legend and which Feuchtwanger subsequently turned into a novel (*Simone*, 1943, English translation, 1944).

³⁴ He demands, in fact, what Miller, with regard to his play, called the "handing over" of conscience and considered the "real and inner theme" of *The Crucible*: "the handing over of conscience to another, be it woman, the state, or a terror, and the realization that with conscience goes the person, the soul immortal, and the 'name.'" See Arthur Miller, introduction to *Arthur Miller's Collected Plays: With an Introduction* (New York: Viking, 1957), 47. Bell, 114, has already drawn this connection in his comparison of the two plays.

³⁵ As Dahlke, 793, has pointed out, Brecht sharply criticized exactly this kind of stance taken by the scientist in the second version of his *Life of Galilei*.

³⁶ Frank Stern, "November 9, 1945. Alfred Döblin, One of the First German-Jewish Writers to Return to Germany, Arrives in the French Occupation Zone," in *Yale Companion to Jewish Writing and Thought in German Culture, 1096–1996*, ed. Sander L. Gilman and Jack Zipes (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 634–41 (636).

³⁷ Curt Riess, "Berliner Theater," in *National-Zeitung Basel* 302 (2/3 July 1949): n.p. (Feuchtwanger Archive, E8a).

³⁸ Gerhard Klingenberg (dir.), *Wahn oder der Teufel in Boston* [TV feature film], with Cornelia Froboess (Germany, 1965). No recording available. This film aired on *Westdeutscher Rundfunk* on 21 November 1965 at prime time (8:15 PM).

³⁹ Review in *Abendpost* (23 Nov. 1965) (clipping in Feuchtwanger Archive, E8a). The wealth of reviews of this production deserves further study.

⁴⁰ A letter by the television station's press agency to Marta Feuchtwanger, dated 24 December 1965, cites a "Sehbeteiligung" (percentage of televisions in use at a specific time) of 39 percent, as measured by the market research institution *Infratest* and a "Urteilsindex" (rating) of "+2" (excellent) (Feuchtwanger Archive, E8a). Publisher Dr. Köhler (Verlag für Bühne, Film und Funk) wrote to Marta Feuchtwanger on 10 January 1966 that the film was "außerordentlich gut angekommen" (received exceptionally well; *ibid.*).

⁴¹ Review in *Süddeutsche Zeitung* (23 Nov. 1965): n.p. (clipping in Feuchtwanger Archive, E8a).

⁴² In Mussey's translation, a "lying little tattle-tale."

⁴³ According to Lothar Kahn, who wrote the first monograph on Feuchtwanger, this trait characterized the author on the whole and clearly distinguished him from dogmatic forms of Marxism. See Kahn, *Insight and Action: The Life and Work of Lion Feuchtwanger* (Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1975), 129.

⁴⁴ Such may be the case throughout his oeuvre of "historical" fiction and drama, where he reduces the historical aspect in order to frame and provide background for current issues. This idea is argued by Reich-Ranicki, 451.

⁴⁵ Reich-Ranicki, 446, who has since risen to become Germany's first celebrity literary critic, characterized him in 1977 as "one of those writers who directly announce everything they have to say, and not just once; in his books everything is explicated in great detail, nothing omitted, nothing alluded to. He makes it easy for his audience, maybe too easy." My translation.

⁴⁶ Feuchtwanger, "Zu meinem Stück," 575. My translation.

⁴⁷ In the anniversary edition of 1984, Hans Dahlke, 795–97, wrote that *Devil in Boston* was Feuchtwanger's most-performed play in the German-speaking countries in the second half of the twentieth century, when it was also broadcast on radio and television. This statistic is of dubious value, as he conceded that in the GDR it had not been played at all since 1965, and in Austria it was performed only one season, in 1977 in Linz. It was also produced in Pforzheim (Germany) in 1982 and in Winterthur (Switzerland) in 1972–73.

⁴⁸ It may be no coincidence that the first German television version was broadcast in 1967, that is, after the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials against personnel in Nazi concentration camps. The trials took place from 1963 to 1965, and in other towns such as Limburg as late as 1967. Reviews of the broadcast (Feuchtwanger Archive, E8a) make no reference to them, though.

⁴⁹ Only one recent study has remarked that the character is "eine eindeutige Anspielung auf Hitler" (an unambivalent allusion to Hitler), but without proving or building an argument on this assertion. See Vaupel, 24.

⁵⁰ Dahlke, 791.

⁵¹ See *ibid.*, 795.

⁵² Stern, 636.

⁵³ Hannah Arendt and Karl Jaspers, *Correspondence, 1926–1969* (New York: Harcourt, 1992), 31–32.

⁵⁴ Feuchtwanger had already published a short story, "Der treue Peter" (Faithful Peter), in 1946 in the Berlin journal *Aufbau*. He was one of the most important Jewish intellectuals who did not return in person but who visited and/or continued to write about Germany and cooperated with intellectuals and publishers there. The 1949 staging of his play is especially notable because, as Stern, 638, notes, their "writings usually did not emerge in the late 1940s."

⁵⁵ The constitution (*Grundgesetz*) of the Federal Republic came into effect 23 May 1949, that of the German Democratic Republic not until 7 October 1949. Berlin was under blockade by the Soviets, forcing its division, until May 1949, one of the first pinnacles of the Cold War.

⁵⁶ Stern, 636–37.